

way that settler colonialism operates, as it clouds the intentions—and institutions—of the settler state as benevolent in relation to Indigenous peoples.

These considerations speak to a larger question: How does continued settler colonialism affect the operation of modern treaty governance structures? Analyzing Indigenous influence on boards, for example, must take into consideration Indigenous communities' continued battle with poverty, substance abuse, domestic and gender-based violence, racism and myriad challenges navigating the education and health systems—all symptoms of settler colonialism. In addition, many of the Indigenous nations within the territorial North practised matrilineal and matriarchal governance systems prior to the imposition of the Indian Act. Yet, as White notes, women—Indigenous women specifically—have very low representation on claims boards. Women both hold and enact Indigenous governance values and are part and parcel to traditional governance systems, but first the Indian Act and now, arguably, modern treaty processes erode their centrality.

Readers seeking empirical research on the nuances of claims board governance as an extension of modern treaty governance will wholeheartedly welcome White's contribution. Certainly, political scientists, an intended audience of this book, will greatly appreciate and uphold its empirical analysis of the operations of this new tripartite institution in Canada. In pursuit of equity, though, I wonder about the accessibility of this style of text for everyday Indigenous peoples—community members, hunters, cultural practitioners, aunties, youth, and so on. They are the potential claims board members and/or active participants in their nations' governance systems: What of their education, awareness and *further* empowerment? How might *Indigenous Empowerment through Co-management* be presented, disseminated or shared otherwise in order to benefit the peoples and communities in real need of the findings this work presents?

## Response to Lianne Charlie's review of *Indigenous Empowerment through Co-management*

Graham White, University of Toronto ([gwhite@chass.utoronto.ca](mailto:gwhite@chass.utoronto.ca))

Readers of the *Journal* are well served—as am I—by Lianne Charlie's review (Charlie, 2020). Fair-minded and thoughtful, it raises difficult but important questions as to mainstream political science's role in understanding and addressing the needs and aspirations of Canada's Indigenous peoples.

I have no complaint about her assessment of the book as a work of standard political science. How could I, when she describes it as “an impressively detailed analysis” and “a substantial and generous contribution to the field”? As well, that she recognized my attempts at nuanced analysis of very complex issues is reassuring. My only quibble is that she notes the “wide range of written and interview sources” underpinning the book but doesn't mention the many board meetings I attended, which were exceptionally valuable sources of information and insight.

Especially important in Charlie's review is her comment that “alternative perspectives rooted in Indigenous theory challenge elements of his analysis.” That's putting it mildly. She asks, quite rightly, whether the treaty process requirement that Indigenous peoples extinguish Aboriginal title to much of their territories in exchange for certain rights can lead to genuine power-sharing. This is a fundamentally important question. Many Indigenous leaders, but by no means all, have decided that such a compromise is indeed warranted. Less clear is what the members of various Indigenous communities think. Charlie says that I don't believe there is a viable alternative to co-management, despite evidence of functioning alternatives “albeit on

localized scales.” That’s not quite what I argued. My position is that while various authors, Indigenous and non-Indigenous, contend in very abstract ways that far better alternatives than co-management exist, I’ve not seen concrete, feasible proposals for alternative governance regimes capable of dealing with the vast range (and geography) of issues that co-management is designed for.

I’m a little surprised that Charlie did not allude to a powerful anti-co-management argument put forward by scholars whom I greatly respect. Not only are better alternatives possible, they maintain, but the limited gains offered by co-management schemes are outweighed by their imposition of Euro-Canadian governance processes that seriously erode Indigenous culture. I struggled with this, ultimately concluding that given the adaptability of Indigenous cultures and the agency provided by co-management, overall, co-management entails more gains than losses.

I just referred to *Euro-Canadian*. For Charlie, my use of this term obscures the profound impact of settler colonialism, especially with regard to political institutions. Not for a moment do I dispute the power and reach of settler colonialism. My recourse to *Euro-Canadian* was meant to highlight a specific element of settler colonialism, especially evident among claims boards: modes of thought and operation intrinsic to the Western bureaucratic state. The larger question, of course, as Charlie points out, involves evaluating Indigenous influence through co-management in the larger context of the continuing, multifaceted impact of settler colonialism on Indigenous peoples. I was certainly aware of this need throughout the research and writing but knew that, fundamental as it is, I simply lacked the insight and experience to examine and evaluate it properly. Few traditional non-Indigenous political scientists, I suspect, are so equipped.

Accordingly, we need Indigenous scholars like Charlie to engage in this (and related) important work. So, too, while I like to think that *Indigenous Empowerment through Co-management* makes a useful contribution, Charlie is right that bringing its findings to the peoples and communities in need of them requires an approach not involving 400-page academic tomes. Here the prospects of collaboration between Indigenous approaches and university-based political science may be more promising.

## Reference

Charlie, Lianne Marie Leda. 2020. Review of *Indigenous Empowerment through Co-management: Land Claims Boards, Wildlife Management, and Environmental Regulation*, by Graham White. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S000842392000092X>.

## Brazil in the International System: The Rise of a Middle Power

Wayne A. Selcher, ed., New York: Routledge, 2019, pp. 280 (eBook).

Mamadou L. Sarr, Assane Seck University of Ziguinchor (mamadou-lamine.sarr.1@ulaval.ca; lamine1403@outlook.com)

This edited volume was first published in 1981 in the context of the Cold War. Re-issued almost 40 years later in a very different global context, the book addresses a subject—the international relations of Brazil—that has lost none of its interest and significance.

In the foreword, Ronald M. Schneider asks, “Is Brazil now or is it soon to become a major power? What is the degree of correspondence between this continent-sized country’s